

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/830,211	04/21/2004	Fei Ge	50277-2433	9360		
43425 7590 02/09/2009 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE			EXAM	EXAMINER		
			MORRISON, JAY A			
SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, C.	A 95110-1083	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
,		2168				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			02/09/2009	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/830,211	GE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAY A. MORRISON	2168	

	JAY A. MORRISON	2168						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.						
1. So The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. If no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any seamed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). 								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);						
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for					
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•						
7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	planation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 1-50.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See continuation sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Tim T. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Applicant argues that the amendments to claims 47 and 48 to specify "hardware processors" does overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection of these claims since now the claims explicitly recite hardware in these system claims. Therefore these rejections are withdrawn.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Jagadish does not disclose "wherein said nodes form a hierarchy; wherein each node is either an XML file or a container", it is respectfully submitted that the aforementioned reference does disclose these limitations as shown on page 3 of the Final Action mailed 11/26/2008.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Jagadish does not disclose "storing said statistics in a hierarchical index table", it is respectfully submitted that the aforementioned reference does disclose these limitations as shown on page 5 of the Final Action mailed 11/26/2008.